



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Glóir do Dhia an rna hárbuib, agur ríobcán air an dtalam beagtoil do na dáoinib.

LXXXII. 14.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. II.—No. 13.

JANUARY, 1853.

{ Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d.
Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
The Dead Hand—Mortmain	1
Who was the first Absentee Bishop?	1
Where is it?—a Colloquy	2
The Great Western Schism—No. II.	4
The Doctrine of Intention	5
The Effects of Excommunication	6
A few words upon Indulgences	6
Friendly advice to Country Postmasters	7
Address to our Readers	7
The Touchstone (continued from vol. I, p. 125)	8
CORRESPONDENCE:	
Did our Saviour institute Seven Sacraments?	9
On the Visibility of the Church, by Philalethes	9
The Sin of Jeroboam, by a Lover of Truth	10
On the Douay Bible, by Mr. O'Reilly	11
From Mr. M. Dolan on the Benefits of Purgatory	11
Farming Operations for January	11

THE DEAD HAND—MORTMAIN.

There is no subject which we think ought to be urged more frequently on the attention of Roman Catholic laymen than the obvious tendency which the leading doctrines and rules of discipline, by which the Roman Catholic Church differs from the other professing Christian Churches, have to promote and extend the power and influence of the clergy, and to enrich the great ecclesiastical corporation of which they are members. And when they remember that the same body which derives such power, influence, and wealth from those doctrines and that discipline, as far as they can, stifle and forbid all inquiry into and discussion of them, it surely should excite suspicion in their minds that the origin and foundation of those doctrines and rules will not bear investigation and discussion.

In the ordinary transactions of life, this undoubtedly would be the result. Take, for example, a familiar instance. If the heir to a large estate was told that his father had made a will limiting and restricting the rights the law would otherwise have conferred upon him; that, by that will, the possession of his father's inheritance was subject to conditions, and clogged with limitations, which nothing but the clearest expression of intention on the part of the parent would induce a court of law to give effect to; that, instead of becoming his own master at the age which the law recognises as the age of discretion, he was to remain in tutelage and under the control of guardians during all his natural life; that his conduct and actions throughout the whole of his existence were to be regulated by their wishes and directions. Would he not, in such a case, examine most scrupulously the authenticity and construction of that will? Would he not subject it to investigation, and test its legality? And if, on demanding inspection of the instrument imposing such restrictions on him, he was to be told by those in whose possession the will was, and who claimed to be the guardians appointed by it, that he should not be allowed any opportunity of making such investigations; what, we ask, would be his course under such circumstances? Would any man, in such a case, tamely acquiesce in the claims put forward by the alleged guardians? Would he quietly resign those rights which the laws of his country bestowed upon him, and yield implicit belief to the assertions of those whose interest it was to keep him in tutelage and ignorance? On the contrary, would he not vehemently suspect that the alleged will had no real existence, or was, at least, erroneously interpreted? Now, if such would be our conduct in the ordinary transactions of life, why do we not apply the same reasoning and the same inferences to spiritual matters? We all, in the words of Scripture, are heirs of God and joint-heirs of Christ; heirs of that will and testament delivered by God the Father through his Son, and sealed by his blood—joint-heirs of that eternal life revealed in that will. The Church of Rome and her priests say they are the appointed guardians and interpreters of that will; and, as they interpret it,

the joint-heirship to eternal life is limited and controlled at the will and pleasure of themselves as guardians; and when the disinherited layman asks to see and inspect the will in question, these self-constituted guardians indignantly refuse to satisfy his curiosity.

We ask, therefore, Roman Catholic laymen, ought not this refusal to excite their suspicions as to the real contents of the will and testament of their Heavenly Father? Are they willing to resign their birthright at the bidding of those who say that birthright belongs only to those who submit in all things to their rule and governance? And when they find that every one of those doctrines, and all those rules of discipline which other churches reject as not contained in that will, tend materially to promote the power, influence, and wealth of those self-constituted guardians, surely the suspicion created by their refusal to allow free interpretation of the will assumes new force and increased strength, and ought to be removed only by the clearest and most unimpeachable evidence. That such is their tendency we will now endeavour to show, and for that purpose will notice more in detail some of the principal of them.

In ecclesiastical government and discipline the most marked difference between the Church of Rome and that of England may be found in the forced celibacy of the clergy, and in the recognition and encouragement of monasteries and nunneries. By the former of these the clergy are severed from all those ties which would otherwise bind and connect the clergy with their lay brethren. To the individual so severed the exaltation of the church is the only object of ambition. Shut out from the ordinary affections and charities of social life, his existence is wrapt up in that of the corporation to which he belongs. Is he pious? His piety hopes for the spread of religion through the extended dominion of the church. Is he ambitious? His ambition can only be gratified by the supremacy and exaltation of that body to which he belongs. Is he selfish and self-indulgent? That selfishness and self-indulgence finds its easiest gratification in the increased wealth and importance of the same body. Take, again, the institution of monasteries and nunneries. Their vows are vows of poverty; but that vow is only as to the individual member, and does not interfere with the acquisition of wealth by the society of which he is a member; and when we remember the age at which persons become members of those institutions, the class of society from which alone novices are sought, it would be, perhaps, impossible to devise institutions more calculated to accumulate wealth; and such, indeed, practically has been their effect in every country and in all past ages of the world.

Again, if we take the distinguishing doctrines of the Church of Rome in matters of faith, the result is the same. It is hardly necessary to point out how materially the doctrine of the infallibility of the church tends to exalt the clergy, who are the only recognised agents in disclosing and interpreting its infallible decrees. For though, theoretically they may say that the infallibility resides in general councils, or in the Pope himself, or in the received tradition of the church, practically the teaching of the individual priest, claiming, of course, to be in conformity with the doctrines of their church, and forbidding inquiry and discussion by the laity, is put forward by each with a claim to infallibility. Again, in the doctrines of purgatory, of confession, and of priestly absolution, not only is the priest exalted, but who does not see that, in them, unfailing sources are opened up for pouring into the coffers of the church the wealth of weak and frightened sinners? Tell the weak and pious devotee that the remission of his sins is in the hands of his priestly adviser—that by his absolution the pains of purgatory may be alleviated and abridged. His piety tells him that, notwithstanding all his prayers and all his desire to serve God, he is still but an unprofitable servant; and with all this consciousness of sin about him, is it likely that, at the approach of death, he would resist the exhortation to bestow his goods on those who would use them for the alleged good of his soul? Nor are the same doctrines less effectual with the profligate and worldly-minded. Tell such a one, when the approach of death warns him that he is soon to leave those pleasures and riches which constitute his happiness in this

world, that his condition in a future state depends on the bestowal or withholding of the last rites of the church, and then suggest that his peace with God may be made by the devotion of that wealth he can himself no longer enjoy to so-called pious uses. Every feeling of his selfish and hardened heart is enlisted in favour of such a disposition of his goods. That very selfishness which never hesitated to sacrifice the interests of others to the gratification of his own desires, or the advancement of his own interest, will now make him sacrifice the temporal interests of those nearest and dearest to him to that which is now paramount in his thoughts—namely, his spiritual safety.

We might extend these observations more at length; but we have noticed them in this brief manner as an introduction to a document to which we hope to call the attention of our readers more in detail in succeeding numbers. We allude to the recent report, presented by the Mortmain Committee to the House of Commons. In that remarkable mass of evidence we have numerous instances of the practical workings of the Roman Catholic system. There we will find detailed how unscrupulously the emissaries of Rome pursue, with calumny and persecution, those who dare to dispute her claims to universal obedience. How indefatigably she prosecutes her great object, of bringing all matters, whether spiritual or temporal, under her guidance and control. How the vow of obedience and poverty becomes the instrument of extorting from the unhappy devotees that property, all claim to which was supposed to have been renounced on admission within the walls of the convent. And, above all, there will be found numerous and well-established cases, in which the weak and aged, in the very hour of dissolution, at the instigation of their spiritual advisers, and in many instances by their intervention, in actually framing the necessary documents, have forgotten the claims of relations and friends, and have impoverished their own families, in order to swell the wealth and promote the objects of the Romish Church. We hope to proceed with this subject in our next.

WHO WAS THE FIRST ABSENTEE BISHOP?

In the first article of our first number, which formed the prospectus of our periodical, and, as it were, struck the key-note to which our other articles were to be attuned, we spoke of the misfortunes of Ireland, and the way to remedy them, as a subject which should engage our especial attention. It may, perhaps, then have struck some of our readers as an omission, that we, in our last volume, have not said a word about absentees. To give a dissertation on absentee landlords, however, would but ill harmonize with the other topics of our paper; so we hope our readers will be satisfied if we give them instead a few of our thoughts on absentee bishops.

It seems plain enough, that if an absentee landlord be a bad thing, an absentee bishop is even worse. The meaning of the word bishop is an overseer; and what supervision can be exercised by one who is habitually absent? How can one far removed from them keep a watch over the faith and morals of his flock? And if, even with modern facilities of communication, a non-resident bishop must be felt to be one who neglects his duty, what must have been the case in ancient times, when penny-postage, and railroads, and electric telegraphs were unknown, and when such things had not been imagined, even in fairy tales? Accordingly, the practice of non-residence was almost unknown in the primitive church; and there exist both canons of councils and sayings of Fathers condemning anything resembling it. "Having read the Scriptures," says St. Athanasius (Apol. i.), "you know how great an offence it is for a bishop to forsake his church, and to neglect the flocks of God." Pope Paschal II. says, in his 22nd epistle—"Bishops ought to be disentangled from secular cares, and take charge of their people; and not to be long absent from their churches." Even in later times, the second Lateran Council enjoins (Can. 10)—"That churches be not committed to hired ministers; but that every church, which has the means, have its own proper priest." And, again, the third Lateran Council directs

(Sess. 13)—“When a church, or the ecclesiastical ministry, be to be committed to any man, let such a person be found out for this purpose who can reside upon the place, and discharge the cure by himself; but, if it be done otherwise, then let him who has received lose that which he has taken contrary to the holy canons.”

In after times, however, we know that the corrupt practice prevailed of a bishop wholly absenting himself from his see, enjoying, indeed, its revenues, and taking rank according to its dignity; but either wholly neglecting its duties or else discharging them by some hired substitute. It would be a pleasure, surely, at least, if we could find out who was the first to set an example of such neglect of duty, and if we could brand him with perpetual infamy. Full of these thoughts we took up, as our most trustworthy guide, Cardinal Baronius, the famous Roman Catholic ecclesiastical historian; and though, no doubt, there did not seem much use in looking at the early volumes, still, for fear of passing over the first delinquent, we thought it best to begin at the beginning. One of the first things that attracted our attention, as we glanced through the history of the first century, was the heading of the pages which were marked with the year of the Lord, the year of the emperor's reign, and also the year of the pontificate of the reigning Pope, St. Peter being the name of the Pope which first met our eye. On examining when his pontificate commenced we found that he is stated to have taken possession of the See of Rome A.D. 45, in the second year of the Emperor Claudius, resigning then the bishopric of Antioch, which he had held for seven years before. He is stated to have been Bishop of Rome for twenty-five years—a length of time which no succeeding Pope has equalled; so that it has become a customary address to a newly elected Pope, “Thou must not expect to see the years of Peter.” When we read this, it struck us how much less strict the rules of the church were in the apostles' time than they became shortly afterwards; for it was reckoned, in the primitive ages, a discreditable thing for a bishop to migrate from one see to another, and more especially from a poorer to a richer. Several of the Fathers inveighed against the practice, as a kind of spiritual adultery (giving up a poorer wife for a richer); and the same practice has been condemned by several councils—Nice, Chalcedon, Antioch, Sardica, &c. Thus Pope Leo I. decreed (Ep. 84, c. 4)—“If any bishop, despising the meanness of his city, seeks for the administration of a more eminent place, and upon any occasion whatsoever transfers himself to a greater people, he shall not only be driven out of the see which is another's, but he shall also lose his own.” Surely Pope Leo, and the other popes who made similar decrees, ought not to have been so severe, if they had only recollected how their own predecessor, St. Peter, had obtained the Bishopric of Rome by abandoning the See of Antioch, which he had formerly held. Doubtless, however, the apparent irregularity of this proceeding must be accounted for by the fact, that the discipline of the church was not so strictly maintained in the apostles' time as in the purer ages that succeeded them!

Let us, then, pass on from the question how St. Peter obtained the See of Rome, to examine how he administered it. And it is a curious fact, that though we read a good deal in Scripture both of St. Peter and the city of Rome after the year A.D. 45, we do not once read of the two being together. We read of St. Peter being at Jerusalem (Acts xv. 7) or at Antioch (Gal. ii. 11), where St. Paul “withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed.” There is reason to think that he was in Corinth (1 Cor. i. 12) and (as St. Epiphanius also agrees) in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, to which places he directed his general epistle (1 Peter i. 1). Many are also of opinion that his general epistle was written from Babylon, in Assyria (1 Pet. v. 13); but there is no Scripture evidence that he ever was in Rome. Of course we do not, like some Protestants, bring forward these passages as proving that he never was in Rome, but only that he did not constantly reside there. Again, when we read of the city of Rome in the New Testament, we have good grounds for thinking that St. Peter was not there. St. Paul directed to the Church of Rome one of his longest epistles; but among the numerous salutations which he sends at the end to the Roman Christians, by name, there is not one mention of St. Peter; and, indeed, we can scarcely doubt but that, if the Roman Church had enjoyed at the time the benefit of an inspired apostle residing among them as their bishop, St. Paul would have directed his letter to some church that wanted it more. Again we are told (Acts xviii. 30) that St. Paul resided for two years at Rome; and we know that during that time he wrote several letters (e.g., Epistle to the Galatians, the Ephesians, the Philippians, the Colossians, to Philemon, and the second to Timothy); but though in these he sends several salutations from the Roman Christians, by name, to those whom he addressed, St. Peter's name does not once occur. In particular, St. Peter could not have been at Rome when St. Paul wrote (Col. iv. 11) respecting Tychicus, Onesimus, Aristarchus, Marcus, and Justus—“These only are my fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God which have been a comfort unto me.” Or, again, when he wrote (2 Tim. iv. 11)—“Only Luke is with me.” Or, again (2 Tim. iv. 18)—“At my

first answer no man stood with me, but all men forsook me: I pray God that it may not be laid to their charge.”

We were happy to find that, in inferring from these passages that St. Peter was not constantly resident in Rome, we had the support of Cardinal Baronius, who also gives very satisfactory reasons for his absence; for it must be remembered that St. Peter was an Apostle, and, as such, “it was his duty not to stay in one place, but as much as it was possible for one man to travel over the whole world, to bring those who did not yet believe to the faith, and thoroughly to establish believers.” (Baron. Ann. lviii. sec. 51.) The Acts also contain full accounts of the earlier parts of St. Peter's apostleship; but in those days (Acts ix. 32) he is spoken of as passing through all quarters, and it is not likely that he got lazier as he got older. And we have in St. Paul a specimen of the work of an apostle. He says (Romans xv. 19), that from Jerusalem, round about to Illyricum, he had fully preached the Gospel of Christ; and even this did not satisfy him, for he designed (v. 24) going to Spain besides. Surely we cannot think that St. Peter was less active in doing apostles' work. Baronius gives us to understand that St. Peter left Rome at the commandment of the Emperor Claudius, that all Jews should depart from Rome; and, however strange it may seem that a Christian bishop, noted for courage, should abandon his see at the command of a heathen ruler, there can be no doubt that St. Peter was well employed when he was away. Baronius enumerates (p. 537) the names of a variety of churches which claim to have been planted by St. Peter or his disciples—Mauritania, Numidia, Britain, all Italy, Gaul, Spain, Africa, Sicily, and the adjacent islands. “How,” says he on another occasion (An. xxxix. p. 272), “could he who had the care, not of one city only, but of all Christendom, who was bound to provide for all, to visit all, if he could, to instruct, to admonish all—in short, to feed the whole flock intrusted to him—how could he (and especially in times when the Christian faith was everywhere assailed, both by Jews and Gentiles)—how could he be confined within the limits of one city, however dignified, and not rather (as St. Luke testifies he did) go round and visit all the churches?”

Nothing can be more satisfactory than this. The cardinal has clearly proved that St. Peter's duty, as an apostle, made it impossible for him to confine himself to a residence at Rome. But, then, a perplexity remains. Why did St. Peter undertake the office of Bishop of Rome when he must have known that his higher engagements, as apostle, must prevent him from discharging the duty of bishop to a particular church? For St. Paul, we know, who says he had the care of all the churches, never fettered himself by undertaking the lower office of bishop of a particular see. What could have induced St. Peter to act differently? It could not have been because the office of Bishop of Rome was the highest place in the church, because every one agrees that the See of Rome had not this dignity before St. Peter became its bishop; nor could it be the title of bishop of the metropolis, for St. Peter, who had the title of apostle, needed not to covet any other; and we know that in his epistles he never calls himself Bishop of Rome. And, surely, we cannot think that his inducement was money, and that he took possession of the revenues of the richest see, paying a curate for doing his duty; for it is remarkable that some early authorities speak of Linus or Clement as Bishop of Rome at the very time that Baronius represents St. Peter to have filled that see.

Altogether we closed the volume in very disagreeable perplexity. There was no use in searching through its pages for any later examples of absentee bishops, if any of those who, in after ages, neglected their sees, could plead with truth that St. Peter had set them the pernicious example.

But when we reflected on the matter, we said, No, the thing is impossible. We must have been imposed on. St. Peter must have been calumniated. He never could have undertaken an office the duties of which he did not mean to fulfil. And he never could have thought that a bishop could discharge his duties without residing among his people. No doubt, if he ever was at Rome (or wherever he was), apostolic authority must have superseded episcopal, and the advice of the inspired apostle must have been implicitly followed in the government of the church. But knowing, as he did, that his apostolic commission required him to travel about constantly, he could never have accepted an inferior office, the duties of which required him to remain constantly in the same place. And the story of his having been Bishop of Rome must have originated in the emulation which existed among the ancient churches, all of whom were anxious to head their list of bishops with the most venerable name they could find. And, after all, there is as ancient authority to connect the name of St. Paul as that of St. Peter with the appointment of the first Bishop of Rome.

There is, however, one serious objection to our settling the question in this way. St. Peter's having been Bishop of Rome is one of several things which must be proved before we can establish the Pope's supremacy and infallibility. And if it should appear that St. Peter

was not Bishop of Rome, down will come the whole theory of the Pope's supremacy, just like a house of cards when you pull the bottom cards away. Can any of our Roman Catholic readers tell us how we are to avoid this very disagreeable consequence?

WHERE IS IT?—A COLLOQUY.

An inquirer after truth was lately discussing theology with a reverend convert from the Protestant faith to the Church of Rome. Transubstantiation, Purgatory, the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Invocation of Saints, and the worship of the Blessed Virgin Mary formed, of course, subjects of great interest in the discussion; but it is not our present object to repeat what was said on either side on any of those interesting subjects; and we shall take up the discussion at the point on which the reverend convert to the Church of Rome ultimately was induced to take his stand, in acknowledging that he had not become convinced of any of the peculiar tenets of Rome by reasoning or reading upon them, but took them all on trust, as matters resolved and settled by the infallibility of the church whose tenets they are.

Inquirer.—But, reverend sir, assuming, for the sake of argument, that it were possible for me to lay all my doubts and difficulties at the foot of infallibility, as you seem to have done, will you come to the practical point, and tell me *where it exists*, that I may find it and avail myself of it? There may be a physician able to heal my sickness of the body, but if I know not where to find him his skill will remain useless to me, and my sickness remain unhealed; and, in the same way, supposing that this infallible tribunal exists *somewhere*, for the solution of my doubts, it will remain utterly useless unless I know where to find it, in order to avail myself of it and cast my difficulties at its feet. Where is it?

Father M.—It is in the church, speaking by its infallible head—the Pope.

Inquirer.—How am I to be assured of that? I have always heard it is said to be *somewhere* in the church; but I know that much difference exists among theologians in the Church of Rome as to the precise *somewhere*. One class of them is said to hold that infallibility resides in the popes; a second class that it resides in the councils; and a third class asserts that it is not in either of them separately, or in both conjointly, but that it resides diffused through the church generally. These several classes of theologians always seem to argue very ably in proving that their adversaries are wrong, but to reason very weakly and defectively when endeavouring to establish their own views; and I, therefore, am anxious to learn which of those systems you have founded your belief on as the true one.

Father M.—The French divines formerly held that infallibility resided in general councils and not in the popes; the Italian divines hold that it resides in the popes and not in councils; there seems to be a leaning now everywhere in favour of the popes; and, for my own part, I hold it to be in the popes.

Inquirer.—It seems a strange thing that if there be a *certainly* infallible tribunal, there should be any *uncertainty* as to where it is, or in what it consists. If your doctrine of the Pope's infallibility be the true one, it was, of course, always true of every true Pope since the days of St. Peter, and one would think would have been universally acknowledged in all ages. What say you to the Council of Basle, which was composed of a crowd of bishops and clergy, who came together from all parts of Europe, and yet decreed, in its 33rd session, that “none of the faithful did ever doubt of this truth—that the Pope, in things belonging to faith, was subject to the judgment of the same general councils.” And in session 38, “that the council has an authority immediately from Christ, which the Pope is bound to obey.” Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini (who was afterwards a Pope himself, Pius II.), advocated that opinion in that council, in many learned and eloquent speeches, and sarcastically but acutely attributed the numbers on the Pope's side to this *good reason*—“that the Pope dispossess of benefices, but the councils give none.”

Father M.—You forget that the Council of Basle was opposed by the Pope, Eugenius IV., and that, when Æneas Sylvius became Pope himself, he changed his opinion, and published a Bull of retraction, declaring that as Æneas Sylvius he was a damnable heretic, but as Pius II. he was an orthodox pontiff!

Inquirer.—I am not ignorant of those singular facts; but you must allow me to say, that a matter so stiffly contested among themselves by Roman Catholic divines gains but little strength from either of them. That popes should ambitiously contend for superiority is natural enough, though some of them have disclaimed the title of Universal Bishop, if they are not misrepresented. But I cannot consent to take any Pope's word for his own infallibility, as that is the very matter to be proved.

Father M.—Whatever differences may have existed in the church, there is, nevertheless, very high authority in favour of the Pope—Baronius, Bellarmine, Albertus Pighius, Hosius, Canus, Aquinas, Cajetan, Pallavicini,

* Nec unquam aliquis peritiorum dubitavit summum Pontificem, in his quæ ad eum concernunt iudicio eorumdem conciliorum universali etiam subiectum.—Cone. Basil. decret. p. 117. Concilium habet potestatem immediate à Christo, cui Papa obediens tenetur.—Cone. Bas. sess. 38, p. 103.